

So it is important to the national security of our country and the employment of our people and the soundness of our economy that we do hydraulic fracking for our natural gas in Haynesville and Marcellus, and that we bring the pipeline oil from Canada-Keystone XL Pipeline in to Houston and refine that petroleum with gasoline and energy for our people.

The pipeline, to the Senator from North Dakota, is very interesting. I ran the State Board of Education in Georgia for years. By law we couldn't build a public school in Georgia if it was within 2,000 feet of an underground pipeline. It is hard in Atlanta, GA, to find a piece of land that isn't within 2,000 feet of an underground pipeline. Today America's energy and petroleum flows rapidly and safely and environmentally soundly in pipelines.

If we weren't using pipelines and we were bringing it on railcars or trucks, we would be producing carbon out the kazoo because those engines would burn petroleum to get the petroleum to Houston. By using the pipeline, it is safe, it is sound, and it is secure.

I think it is basically professional malpractice for this country to fail to approve the Keystone Pipeline or fracking because it hurts our national defense, it makes us dependent on people we shouldn't be dependent on, it hurts our economy, and one day the misery index could come back. If it comes back, it will be because we are held hostage by our own failed policy, not because somebody held us hostage because they were strong.

I want a strong America. I want an America that has strong leadership. I don't want to be a part of any professional malpractice. I want to be a part of seeking the best for our American people—bringing energy to our American people, and being the most competitive economy in the world today.

I appreciate the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for yielding me the time.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his strong support and his clear understanding of why we need this project and for putting the focus on national security.

In poll after poll two-thirds of Americans support this project. I think in the final analysis the American people will make a decision here. If the President after 6 years refuses to make a decision, clearly his strategy is to defeat this project with endless delays, just defeat by delay. So here we are in year 6 of the application process.

I would turn to my colleague from Georgia and ask his thoughts on this body's ability to step up and make the decision and approve this project on behalf of the American people. What does the Senator foresee? We have 57 who have signed on now. I believe we will get to 60. What is the Senator's sense of our ability to get this done for the American people?

Mr. ISAKSON. If, before we left today and had a final vote on the CR,

the majority leader would let a vote come to the floor to get 60 votes to go ahead and move forward on the Keystone Pipeline, in my belief it would happen. For all the reasons I stated and what the American people want and all the reasons the Senator stated, I quite frankly do not understand why one single person in this administration would hold back the Keystone Pipeline.

Correct me if I am wrong, but the State Department has five times approved it; is that not correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is absolutely correct. We have the dates of the approval of five different environmental impact statements right here, all finding no significant environmental impact.

Mr. ISAKSON. So that is No. 1.

No. 2, there is no question that being independent in energy makes us a stronger country in terms of our national defense and our foreign policy; is that not correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is correct.

Mr. ISAKSON. No. 3, we will have more jobs, more employment, less inflation, and a more vibrant economy if we were developing this petroleum; is that not correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is correct.

Mr. ISAKSON. Then I think, knowing the quality and the intellect of the 100 Members of the Senate, there is no doubt that if the leader would bring that vote to the floor today, we would get more than 60 votes to move America forward and say: This Congress is ready to act. We are not in professional malpractice; we in fact are doing good for the American people. We want energy and we want it now.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the good Senator from Georgia.

I understand that our time has expired. I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to wrap up this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. On the facts and on the merits—which is how we have to make decisions for the American people—this is a project about energy, producing energy here at home so we don't have to get it from the Middle East. We know what is going on with the Middle East with ISIL and other organizations that are creating huge problems and that are a danger not only to this country but to the world.

It is about energy here at home and working with our closest friend and ally, Canada. It is about jobs. The State Department itself says more than 40,000 jobs are created with this project. It is about economic activity, a \$5.3 billion project and not one penny of Federal spending, just private investment. It is about national security, as we have talked about.

But it is also about congestion on our rails. It is about making sure we don't try to move all this oil on rail so we have so much congestion, we have accidents, and we have seen that happen. It is about harvest and moving ag prod-

ucts from the heartland throughout the country. It is about using the latest, greatest technology to make sure we produce more energy more dependably and with better environmental stewardship than without the project.

Six years. It is time for this body to step forward on behalf of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### MATTERS OF WAR AND PEACE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I don't think we should adjourn and go home with matters of war and peace in front of us.

This Senator certainly intends to support the appropriations bill, the continuing resolution necessary to keep the government functioning. But one of the issues in this continuing resolution is the authorization in order to start training the Free Syrian Army in Saudi Arabia, and this Senator certainly supports that.

But the issues beyond just that training are very much in front of us, which involves the United States protecting our national security by going after ISIS—or ISIL or whatever you want to call them. It is the group that has already declared war on us. Day by day we see their efforts, and then we hear their statements that they want to fly the black flag of ISIS over the White House. What more do we need to know about the national security being threatened?

Today in a joint session we heard a very inspiring and emotional speech by the President of Ukraine. He so poignantly pointed out how Russia has invaded eastern Ukraine, and it is the Russian Army against the Ukrainian Army. We certainly should be helping them as well, as we are, but it needs to be more.

So, too, the national security of the United States is definitely threatened by ISIS. As I have said over and over, I believe the President has the constitutional authority to strike ISIS in Syria, as he already has in northern Iraq, and that is under his constitutional duty as Commander in Chief. But this is not going to be a strike for a few days; this is going to be a long effort to degrade and defeat—to use the President's words—this threat to America.

So here the Congress of the United States is going to adjourn in the middle of September; and, as I calculate, starting tomorrow it is 55 days until we would return. We need to be talking about war and peace. We need to be talking about the Congress exercising its constitutional authority to give the authority to the President for this long-term effort. The Senate has heard our colleague Senator TIM Kaine of Virginia speak very passionately about this. He believes it very firmly. I only disagree with Senator Kaine to the point that I believe the President has

the authority to strike now to protect the interests of the United States—and I expect President Obama will do that. I am talking about in Syria.

It is clear the President has already appropriately started the attacks, and has done it very well and successfully in the Kurdish region and other regions of northern Iraq, and that will continue as the President feels he has the authority, and I happen to agree. But when it comes to Syria—and that is where the head of the ISIS snake is; and if you are going to kill the snake, you have to go to where the head is and chop it off—I think it is a mistake for us to go home. I think it sends a very bad message not only to our countrymen, but it sends a very bad message to our allies and to our enemies. The opposite message would be sent if we would discuss these matters and come together with a resolution of an authorization for the use of military force and to have that clearly stating that the United States is unified to go after this insidious, evil, brutal, uncivil kind of force. It would send a message of unity not only to our allies, to this country of ours, but to our enemies.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak until I conclude. It may go over that time, but not by much.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND ISIL

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you so much, Madam President.

I am here because I want to respond to the colloquy that was held on the Keystone Pipeline, but before I go there, I do want to make remarks about the very important vote we are going to be taking today both to keep the government open and to give the President the ability to train and equip vetted Syrian moderates so they can help us take the fight to ISIL.

It is my privilege to serve on the Foreign Relations Committee. I have served on it for a very long time, and yesterday we had an important hearing where the Secretary of State laid out the President's plans for how we are going to meet this threat posed by ISIL.

I have to say, before I explain the three options you have as an American as far as which option you embrace, I think I need to lay out the view of this organization ISIL or ISIS. There are different ways to describe them. They are an outgrowth of Al Qaeda in Iraq, which came about because of the catastrophic Iraq war that was based on

false premises, that put us in the middle of a civil war, and created the worst sectarian tensions. One of my proudest moments was voting no on that.

Then the Bush administration said Saddam Hussein was involved with 9/11, that he had nuclear weapons, and none of it was so. None of it was so. As a result we got in the middle of this war.

We were told it would last 6 months, and then a year went by, another year, years, years, years, and it became one of our longest wars, and 4,000-plus Americans dead, tens of thousands wounded, some with very serious wounds—they will never get over them—and I would say well over \$1 trillion that drew us into a terrible recession when we had previously had surpluses. What a nightmare. So that is the beginning of ISIL, an outgrowth of Al Qaeda.

There were two authorizations for the use of military force that I got to vote on. One of them was right after 9/11 when I voted to go after bin Laden and Al Qaeda and any other affiliate organization that would come out of Al Qaeda. That is one I voted for. That is why I believe the President has the authority, based on that document, to move forward and take the fight to ISIL.

The other authorization for use of force was permission to go into Iraq and go after Saddam Hussein. I voted no on that.

I think it is important to the American people to remember why we are facing trouble, but it is what it is. There are some who say—because there are three approaches here—do nothing. There are some who say do nothing. My view is: How can we possibly do nothing in the face of a group that has beheaded two innocent freelance journalists? How can you do nothing in the face of a group that sells 14-year-old girls as slaves? How can you do nothing in the face of a brute, ISIL, who, if they don't sell a 14-year-old as a slave and they let her live, give her to a warrior as a reward? How do we sit back and do nothing?

We saw what they did to minorities, the Yazidis. They said: Either you convert, flee, or we will kill you.

We cannot sit back. They did it to Christians, Yazidis. They did it to Turkmen. They have taken hostages including more than 40 Turkish hostages. We don't even know the count or what are the nationalities, but we know their intent. This is a quote from them, that they are going to make sure their thirst for American blood is quenched. This is a sick situation, and to the people who say do nothing, I say to them: I understand your concern for unintended consequences, but don't count me in your camp, because I cannot do that.

I am so cautious when it comes to voting to go to war. I know it is not easy. We don't know every single thing that can happen, what can go wrong. Things do go wrong. But my view is in this case if I were to sit back and say

I am too afraid, I am too nervous, that is exactly the wrong signal to send a group of terrorists such as this. I have never seen a group like this. So one path is to do nothing.

The other path is to start up the Iraq war all over again. Colleagues in this Chamber, pounding the table: Troops on the ground. Send our American troops back. No way, no way. I am not going to send our troops back to the middle of a civil war. What we are going to do is another way—President Obama's strategy, which is the moderate strategy here. It is to take our intelligence, our strategy, our Air Force assets, and make sure those in the region who have the most at stake—remember, ISIL has killed more Muslims than anybody else—that they will be the boots on the ground. We see that strategy is working in Iraq.

It is early. We don't know how it is all going to go. But we have started this strategy where they will take back key pieces of territory—a dam, very important—and we seem to be able to coordinate well with the Kurds and the Iraqi forces.

Clearly our President is right when he says this is about the whole world. The whole world has to care about this, because this is about, truly, civilization, and every civilized person has to stand up against this. What the President is doing with the Secretary of State and our Vice President is they are building coalitions. For the first time we see the Arab nations coming forward.

So when I vote today for the continuing resolution, I want it to be clear to my constituents—and they are not all going to agree with me, I know that—that I am in favor of this strategy. I am in favor of training the moderate Syrians to take the fight to ISIL on the ground. And I can tell you because I was in Turkey in August—I had the privilege of meeting with the head of one of the moderate Syrian organizations. His comments were very strong that ISIL is absolutely going against the moderate Syrians. So it is very important that the moderate Syrians are able to fight back against ISIL. That is what we are voting for today, to allow the President to vet, train, and arm the moderate Syrian opposition to the Syrian President and also in that regard go after ISIL.

I know everything is complicated in life and nothing is the perfect solution, but if I could say rhetorically, what is wrong is to do nothing. What is wrong is to go back into the Iraq war. What is right is to organize the world through a coalition, use the American assets—because no one can do what we can do—but on the ground in the combat mission, utilize the regional forces.

I wanted to be clear today where I stand. There are three choices, and I choose the path President Obama has put together. I think the vote in the House was a very important vote yesterday because it showed there is a majority of Democrats and Republicans who can come together.